



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

R.G.

APPLICATION NO. <del>09/141,287</del> 09/141,287	FILING DATE <del>08/27/98</del> 08/27/98	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR WU	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. H 30-4540-4780
--	--	----------------------------	--

LESLIE WEISE  
ALLIEDSIGNAL INC  
101 COLUMBIA ROAD  
MORRITOWN NJ 07962-2245

MMC1/0606

EXAMINER KIELIN, E
-----------------------

ART UNIT 2813	PAPER NUMBER
------------------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 06/06/00

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/141,287

Applicant(s)

Wu et al.

Examiner

Erik Kielin

Group Art Unit

2813



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Erik Kielin(3) Lawrence Manber (35,597)(2) Charles Bowers(4) Richard Roberts (27,941)Date of Interview Jun 1, 2000Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Smith et al. (US5,736,425)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Agreed on the following points:

(1) that the examiner made a prima facie case of obviousness of claim 1 as originally claimed; (2) that evidence of unexpected results is required for the properties of silicon oxide aerogels formed in a class of organic solvents containing a monomethyl ether function and a single hydroxyl function versus organic solvents containing two hydroxyl functions (i.e. diols); (3) that incorporation of specific heating temperatures would introduce an unclaimed limitation that would require further consideration creating undue burden on the examiner at the present stage of appeal.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Charles Bowers

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2800

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.